



MINUTES

OAK BAY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2016 AT 8:45 AM
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL HALL, 2167 OAK BAY AVENUE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Lynn Gordon-Finlay, Chair
John Armitage
James Kerr

Andrea Nemeth
David Wilkinson
Councillor Tom Croft

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

STAFF PRESENT

Deborah Jensen, Planner

Krista Mitchell, Building/Planning Clerk

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:45 am.

2. Adoption of Minutes

It was moved and seconded that the Minutes from February 2, 2016 be adopted.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

3. Approval of Agenda and Late Items

The agenda was approved as presented, with the exception of moving item 5(c) to 5(a).

4. Old Business

a. ADP00031 – 430 St Patrick Street (Lot 2) - Subdivision

To permit construction of a single family dwelling on a newly subdivided lot.

T. Rodier, applicant, presented the proposal with modifications as discussed at the February meeting of the Advisory Design Panel. Some of the comments were:

- Design changes provide for a more cohesive built form, to better incorporate within the streetscape and better relationship between interior and exterior living areas.
- Eliminated sloped roof and use cedar as primary element.
- Utilizing stucco element to wrap around building and provide relief.
- Adding a new deck off of master bedroom.
- Black brick with gray flecks will be used to define building elements such as the main and rear entrances.
- Accessory building relocated for better connection to house and allowing better use of rear yard.
- Outdoor living areas have been made more accessible from house.
- Main focus still towards front of house and large play area.

Councillor T. Croft left the meeting at 8:54 am and returned to the meeting at 8:55 am.

Panel Comments

The Panel members commented that the revised design is much improved, and some of the comments were:

- Building is calmed down and composition works well, with good outdoor space.
- Applicant should work with the Municipal arborist to determine the specific locations for planting the required trees and the species to be used.
- Better to lower stucco portion for better definition, and group windows in accessory building.
- Window frames and flashing should harmonize in colour with other materials.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Supports seaside setting
2. Setbacks	Confirming
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Appropriately heterogeneous
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Appropriate
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Fine
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	None
7. Overlook and privacy issues	Minimal
8. Transition between private and public space	Treated well
9. Accessory buildings	Acceptable

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Appropriate
2. Roofscape	Good-consider lowering stucco masses in relation to wood massing.
3. Garages and outbuildings	Good

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Good
2. Native plants and vegetation	Check tree bylaw-replacement trees to be placed with careful consideration
3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	N/A
4. Play and recreation areas	Well considered
5. Hard landscaping	Appropriate
6. Parking and driveways	Fine

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00031.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

5. New Business

- a. ADP00040 - 3085 Southdowne Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family dwelling.

T. Rodier, applicant, presented the proposal as a traditional Georgian brick style home. Some of the comments were:

- Proposed materials will be a tan or beige brick with stone window sills.
- Focussing on symmetry in front design, including relocating driveway for a more circular alignment and a walkway up the middle of the site to the two storey dwelling.
- Design allows for side yard parking.
- Design attempts to separate private space (the open back yard that backs onto Uplands Park) from public space (the formal landscape).

Panel Comments

A Panel member stated the realigned driveway seems ‘forced’ and results in loss of a prominent tree, and we should be making accommodation for trees.

T. Rodier replied the proposed driveway helps to frame the house, further stating the existing driveway worked for the existing home but not the new.

D. Jensen indicated municipal departments, including Engineering and Parks, are working together to protect trees where possible, and that this realignment would require a new driveway permit.

Panel members commented the site plan is not showing current information for trees, that the front portion of the property should not be fenced in order to enhance the park like setting and open flow of public to private space. The Panel further commented that consideration should be given to siting of the heat pump, the front entry space is limited and needs additional landing area, and the applicant should consider an alternative to asphalt shingles.

In response to comments from T. Rodier that many Uplands properties have fences in the front yard, the Panel stated the applicant should consider whether the fence is a landscape feature or fortification, and fencing may be appropriate given the site’s proximity to Uplands Park.

Panel members commented on the building design, stating that materials should be kept simple given the significant massing, shutters should be half the width of window openings, and exterior light fixtures should not shine directly on house and should not be clear shades.

The Panel reiterated their concerns with the proposed fence and removal of trees.

T. Rodier confirmed that the trees not identified on the site and landscape plan will not be removed, nor will the mountain ash.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Maintenance of residential park setting | Controversial – fences & gates may present a fortified appearance, but may be required due to local traffic. Applicant to consider minimizing the gated atmosphere. |
| 2. Setbacks | Conforming. |
| 3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area | Appropriate. |
| 4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development | In keeping. |
| 5. Relationship to adjacent buildings | Fine. |
| 6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties | None. |
| 7. Overlook and privacy issues | Consider acoustic treatment around heat pump. |
| 8. Transition between private and public space | See (a) 1. Front entrance could be more gracious to allow more room on porch. |
| 9. Accessory buildings | None |

Design of Buildings

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing | Well done. |
| 2. Roofscape | Nicely handled |
| 3. Garages and outbuildings | N/A. |

Landscaping

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Fencing and screening | See (a) 1. Concerns about front fence/gates only. |
| 2. Native plants and vegetation | Site plan incomplete with trees retained and/or removed. |
| 3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material | Some concerns – plans not clear |
| 4. Play and recreation areas | Fine. |
| 5. Hard landscaping | Rear yard fine. Consider re-planning front entrance driveway to avoid tree removal. |
| 6. Parking and driveways | See 5. |

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00040.

The motion was carried.
J. Kerr and J. Armitage opposed.

b. ADP00038 – 2700 Lansdowne Road – Uplands Siting and Design

To permit construction of a single family dwelling.

T. Rodier, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- This is a craftsman inspired home with dark stained cedar shingle exterior cladding edged with off white trim, steep gable peaks, and ledgerstone feature elements.
- Propose a low height stone fence with iron railing along side and front property lines.
- Driveway to stay in existing location in the Midland Road roadway allowance.

Panel Comments

Panel members stated the accessory building is too close to the adjacent house and access to the building should be relocated to reduce impact on the neighbour. The Panel also identified concerns regarding the proportion of columns to the base, inconsistency between front door composition and upper windows, the too large size of upper windows, and lack of roofline skirting all the way around.

The Panel members indicated this is an overworked version of a craftsman style, but did like the use of adaptable housing, the location of the heat pump, and general details such as wall shingles and gabled treatment. The Panel suggested the roofline be brought down for the upper windows, the triangular windows be reworked, and the dormers be reconsidered.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00038 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

- c. ADP00039 – 3175 Midland Road – Uplands Siting and Design
To permit construction of a single family dwelling.

T. Rodier, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- An easement runs through the centre of the property, thereby pushing the house to the front.
- Proposed home is inspired by traditional indigenous Longhouse, high atrium space runs length of home, and mature Garry oaks frame the house.
- Parks department does not want to remove fir trees on the north side of the property for a driveway.
- Garage is forward on the design, but is accessed at the side of the property.
- Park like setting in front of house and a fence is not needed.

Panel Comments

The Panel members indicated the large oak tree at the driveway is problematic for use of driveway and arborist indicates there is vulnerability to wind. The Panel members also expressed their concerns regarding the number of trees being removed.

T. Rodier stated that selective pruning could occur under arborist supervision.

The Panel members stated a straight wall should be used for garage to improve maneuverability for garage, juxtaposition of different rooflines should be reconsidered, elements should be strong and muscular, and longhouse concept weakened on rear due to the number of windows.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00039 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.

None opposed.

L. Gordon-Findlay left the meeting at 10:51 am and did not return. J. Kerr, Vice Chair assumed the role of Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

d. ADP00036 – 3125 Uplands Road – Uplands Siting and Design

To permit additions to an existing single family dwelling and construction of two accessory buildings. Variances are requested.

R. Collins, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Proposing to remove existing storage room and build small addition within setback, and expand kitchen area, which will require a variance.
- Porte cochere to be partly enclosed to create a grand entry, which will remove ability to drive under the new entry area.
- Detached double garage is proposed that will require a height variance in order to reflect the roof slopes on existing residence, existing driveway will remain.
- May utilize a brick material that closely matches the existing brick of the house.
- Creating a covered outdoor eating area off the dining room.

Panel Comments

The Panel inquired as to comments provided by the Heritage Commission, the roof materials for the cabana, and the proposed design for the porte cochere.

D. Jensen advised the Heritage Commission had reviewed the application twice, including the modifications made by the applicant to address their concerns regarding enclosure of the porte cochere and front entry area, and use of brick versus stone materials.

R. Collins stated the Heritage Commission was supportive of the proposal, and that the cabana would have a metal roof with skylights.

D. Wilkinson left the meeting at 11:08 am and returned to the meeting at 11:16 am.

Panel members suggested the use of a glass roof on the cabana, and moving patio roof to centre it on the building.

D. Jensen advised variances were required for the proposal, and creating a third accessory building on the site by separating the cabana from the pool mechanical room would require an additional variance.

The Panel commented no major changes were needed for proposal, but would like to see some refinements.

It was moved and seconded to recommend that ADP00036 be tabled to a subsequent meeting of the Advisory Design Panel.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

- e. ADP00041 – 52 Maquinna Street (*formerly 48 Maquinna Street*) – Subdivision
To permit construction of a single family dwelling on a newly subdivided lot.
Variances to paved surface are requested.

R. Collins, applicant, presented the proposal. Some of the comments were:

- Advisory Design Panel saw general siting of this home when reviewing adjacent dwelling at 48 Maquinna Street. Some similarities in design, will use limited palette.
- Utilizing internal drains, wood soffits, and wood trim on windows.

Panel Comments

The Panel members inquired as to the variance requested for paving, and suggested combining the stairwell windows to one unit.

R. Collins stated they may use grass strips in driveway to decrease variance request for hard surface, and they could not combine the stairwell windows due to building code.

A Panel member indicated they were opposed to using grass strips as they are often not constructed or maintained, and need to be with the appropriate design of house.

Advisory Design Panel Assessment Checklist

Siting of Buildings

1. Maintenance of residential park setting	Appropriate
2. Setbacks	No variances
3. Relationship of character / massing to image of the area	Consistent with neighboring house
4. Impact on scale and rhythm of development	Appropriate
5. Relationship to adjacent buildings	Good
6. Effect of shadow on neighbouring properties	None
7. Overlook and privacy issues	None
8. Transition between private and public space	Appropriate
9. Accessory buildings	N/A

Design of Buildings

1. General massing, proportion and overall articulation of building in relation to established housing	Appropriate
2. Roofscape	Good
3. Garages and outbuildings	No outbuilding. Consider removal or simplification of garage canopy.

Landscaping

1. Fencing and screening	Good
2. Native plants and vegetation	N/A
3. Preservation of significant healthy trees and plant material	N/A
4. Play and recreation areas	Good
5. Hard landscaping	Appropriate
6. Parking and driveways	Approve layout and support variance request without driveway grass strips

It was moved and seconded to recommend that Council approve ADP00041 subject to the recommendations outlined in the assessment checklist.

The motion was carried.
None opposed.

Councillor T. Croft left the meeting at 11:58 am.

6. Information Items

D. Jensen clarified with the Panel that soffits and lighting will be added to the appropriate checklists.

7. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Design Panel is Tuesday, April 5, 2016.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 pm.